

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 remain in the application. The information disclosure statement (“IDS”) filed on August 13, 2004 is objected to for failing to provide a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,748,980 to Lipe et al. (hereinafter “Lipe”).

### **Response to the objection to the IDS.**

The IDS filed on August 13, 2004 is objected to for failing to provide a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Applicants have included an updated IDS providing a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language.

### **Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lipe. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 include the limitation “...a communication adapter to be enabled to the exclusion of other of the plurality of communication adapters...” Claim 1. See also claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22. Thus the present invention claims enabling a communication adapter to the exclusion of other

communication adapters that are disabled.

The Examiner states that the above limitation is equivalent to the teaching in Lipe that “The modified BIOS can access non-volatile memory to determine which *devices 20 in the integrated bus 15 should be enabled* and other devices 20 that do not have configuration stored in non-volatile memory are preferably disabled” Office Action of September 13, 2006, page 14, lines 10-13 citing Lipe, col. 40, lines 25-43. However, the passage in Lipe discloses that multiple devices may be enabled. Only devices without configuration stored in non-volatile memory are disabled. Lipe does not teach that other devices that have configurations in non-volatile memory, such as because the devices are installed devices, are disabled. Because Lipe does not teach enabling a communication adapter to the exclusion of other communication adapters that are disabled, Applicants assert that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 are allowable.

Applicants have not specifically traversed the rejections of dependent claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, but believe those claims to be allowable for depending from allowable claims. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler  
Reg. No. 38,527  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 13, 2006  
8 East Broadway, Suite 600  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone (801) 994-4646  
Fax (801) 531-1929